

F5012

1855

C319



3 9004 03469542 6

THE
BESIEGERS' PRAYER;

OR,

A Christian Nation's Appeal

TO THE

GOD OF BATTLES,

FOR

SUCCESS IN THE RIGHTEOUS WAR:

A SERMON,

BY THE REVEREND JOHN CARROLL,

Wesleyan Minister,

Preached in St. Johns Canada East, on the occasion of the "General Fast," April the
18th, A. D. 1855.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

Toronto:

PRINTED BY JOHN DONOGH,

AT THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN OFFICE, NO. 9, WELLINGTON BUILDINGS, KING STREET.
1855.

Price Seven Pence Half-penny.

SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS



DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

THE
BESIEGERS' PRAYER;

OR,

A Christian Nation's Appeal

TO THE

GOD OF BATTLES,

FOR

SUCCESS IN THE RIGHTEOUS WAR: .

A SERMON,

BY THE REVEREND JOHN CARROLL,

Wesleyan Minister,

Preached in St. Johns Canada East, on the occasion of the "General Fast," April the
18th, A. D. 1855.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

Toronto:

PRINTED AT THE GUARDIAN OFFICE, NO. 9, WELLINGTON BUILDINGS, KING STREET
1855.

Price Seven Pence Half-penny.

47 F5012 1855 C319

J. DONOGH, PRINTER.

THE BESIEGERS' PRAYER.

Who will bring me into the Strong City? Who will lead me into Edom. Wilt not thou, O God, which hath cast us off? and thou, O God, which didst not go out with our armies? Give us help from trouble: for vain is the help of man. Through God we shall do valiantly: for he it is that shall tread down our enemies.—Psalm lx. 9—12.

This psalm, my christian brethren, relates to that period of sacred history which intervened between the accession of David to the throne of *united* Israel, after the death of Ishbosheth, and the establishment of his ascendancy over the surrounding nations, which he subdued and rendered tributary. It embodies the prayerful solicitude of his heart, it would seem under some partial and temporary reverses, while he was contending with "Syria," "Moab," "the children of Ammon," "the Philistines," "Ama-lek," and "Hadadezer, son of Rehob, king of Zoba:" (2. Samuel viii. 12.) a solicitude which was dissipated by victory; for it is said, "David gat him a name when he returned from smiting the Syrians in the Valley of Salt, being eighteen thousand."—(Verse 13.)

The *text* appears to refer to the siege of BOZRA, the capital of IDUMEA, and to have been expressive of solicitude and prayer for Divine countenance and help on the very eve of storming "the strong city." Beyond this observation we shall not pretend to

examine its *literal* meaning further ; but simply remark, that these words are adapted to express our own solicitude under the present circumstances of the nation, and therefore appropriate as a foundation for our present meditations.

In connection with two other European powers we have been drawn into a war with one of the mightiest and most extended empires on the face of the globe. This war has been raging for a year past. It has at length concentrated itself at one particular point, towards which all eyes are now turned. That point is the city and fortress of SEBASTOPOL in the Crimea, the fall of which is considered essential to the success of the allied cause, and a guarantee for the peace and safety of Europe, if not of the civilized world : for "the existence of the great fortified works of Sebastopol is the basis of the preponderance of Russia, not only in the Black Sea, but over the East." It was fondly thought that the city would have fallen long ago, but it has proved much stronger than was anticipated. It is defended by multitudes of soldiers and the most formidable artillery, within and without ; and abundantly supplied with provisions and munitions of war. Besides which, our armies have had to endure the rigours of a Russian winter, to which they were of course, unused, and for which they were very indifferently equipped. Nay, God, in some sense, seems to have "cast us off," and to have refused to "go forth with our armies." The elements have warred with our otherwise invincible war ships, and

sunk the precious freight of our transports "in the depth of the sea." The "pestilence," also, "which walketh in darkness" has swept away more of our brave defenders than even "the destruction that wasted at noon-day." By consequence, we are deeply in "trouble"—in trouble from which *man* would *vainly* attempt to deliver us. How urgently then do we need to urge the prayer of the Psalmist: "Give us help from trouble, for vain is the help of man!"

It is matter of gratitude that these calamities have brought the nation at length to a proper sense of its dependence on the Great Supreme; and have led to humiliation before Him against whom we have sinned, and to seek "help" (or *Salvation*, as the word signifies) of the Omnipotent. The people of the parent country have been "weeping before the Lord," and this day (April 18th 1855.) is wisely appointed by authority in our own Province, "as a DAY OF GENERAL FASTING AND HUMILIATION AND OF PRAYER TO ALMIGHTY GOD for the success of our Armies in the said war."

Now if we can but succeed in averting God's anger and in obtaining his "help" and his presence with "our armies," it will be well indeed, "Through God we shall do valiantly, for he it is that shall tread down our enemies."

But have we any reason to expect, or any right to seek the Divine interposition in such an enterprise? This question I make bold to answer in the *affirma-*

tive; or to say, WE HAVE A RIGHT TO SEEK HIS AID, AND WE SHALL SUCCEED, IF WE SEEK IT ARIGHT.

In order to establish this position, however, I shall have to consider and determine the three following questions:—

1. *Is an appeal to arms lawful in a Christian Nation, under any circumstances?*
2. *If so, is the present war justified by the circumstances of the case?*
3. *And have we, therefore, any reason to believe that an humble and penitent application to the Almighty, by “prayer and supplication,” will propitiate his help?*

We consider the first proposition.

I. IS AN APPEAL TO ARMS LAWFUL IN A CHRISTIAN NATION, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES?

This is a very serious and important question indeed. It is an awful thing to take a *single* human life—a life which we can neither give, nor restore when we have taken it away. And it is vastly more awful still, to deliberately organize and employ means by which hundreds and thousands, yea, perhaps tens of thousands, if not millions, of our fellow creatures shall be deprived of life, and swept, under circumstances of the most direful agony, from the stage of action into the presence of the Judge of quick and dead. This is a picture which strikes our imagination and enlists our sympathies so strongly as greatly to interfere with the decisions of our judgments. And yet, shocking as may be the con-

clusion to some, after patient deliberation I am compelled to answer the question in the *affirmative*—that such an appeal to arms is sometimes right. We arrive at this conclusion from the following considerations :—

1. *God has invested the civil ruler, the magistrate, with the power of inflicting capital punishment—that is of taking life.* (1.) It is lawful for every man *singly* to do this, when his own life and the lives of those of whom he is the natural protector cannot be preserved in any other way than by taking the life of an assailant. A man who makes a murderous attempt, has justly forfeited his life, and any one is justified in taking it to preserve the life of an innocent person or persons, be it his own life, or that of another. Hence, in a state of *savage independence*, the right of capital punishment, in cases that justify it, rests with the *individual*. But in all *organized communities* of a civil character, the infliction of death on offenders is properly restricted by law to the ruler ; unless, indeed, in case of those emergencies which will not permit of the delay attendant on an appeal to the authorities—those cases where a person must take the life of another, or lose his own. In which case the laws of all civilized nations justify him, or practically make him the witness, judge, jury, and executioner—and thus make the death he causes a real *judicial* infliction. But what further evidence have we that the Ruler himself has the rightful authority to inflict death, in those cases where the welfare of community require it ?

(2) We make our next appeal to Old Testament Revelation. It was said before the giving of the Mosaic law, (Gen. ix, 8.) "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." This text in my opinion not only makes it lawful for human authorities to take the life of a murderer, but makes it *obligatory* on them to do it. The Mosaic law (Numbers xxxv. 33,) taught the same doctrine: "The land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." This also provided that *death* should be inflicted on several other sorts of offenders as well as murderers, all of which goes to prove that the civil ruler, under that dispensation, possessed the power to inflict capital punishment. But do the Christian Scriptures teach this doctrine? This will lead us—

(3.) To consider what the New Testament says on the subject. They state expressly that "kings or governors are sent by God for the punishment of evil-doers." (1 Pet. ii. 13, 14.) ; and that this power of *punishing* extends to the *infliction of death* is plain from the words of the apostle Paul (Rom. xiii. 4.) For he says of the ruler, "He beareth not the SWORD in vain; for he is a minister of God, a messenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Now observe, the instrument put into his hands by Divine authority to execute avenging wrath on the evil-doer! It is the "SWORD." The sword is an instrument for inflicting death, and therefore intended as the emblem of an authority to take away life, if the welfare of community requires it. Observe, the in-

spired apostle gives us to understand that it is no mere effigy, and that the ruler does not bear it for idle display : mark his words ! “ But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid ; *for he beareth not the sword in vain.*” It is on this principle that a christian man may be a magistrate, a sheriff, a constable, or an executioner, if needs require it ; or we may assist the civil authority in arresting and executing *one, ten, twenty,* or a *hundred* offenders against the laws. And on the same principle, we may act as police, as yeomanry and militia-men ; and go out to fight to put down a mob or insurrection ; and do it with as much compassion for their souls as the judge has for the felon whom he sentences to the gallows.

We advance a step further, *and assert that, on the same principles, a Christian Government may take up the sword against external as well as internal disturbers of the peace and welfare of community.* This is only an extension of the right of *self-defence*, which we have shown to rest on a legitimate basis. For it comprehends not only the right of *resisting* violent and lawless *invasion*, but the right of *invading* or otherwise *offensively* punishing another nation for any wrong of sufficient magnitude to call for such reprisals, though it does not justify resorting to such serious means of self-vindication for every trivial offence. Some, perhaps, may fail to see the parallel between a right to inflict punishment on those subject or subordinate to a given power, and that power going to punish offences committed by another power over which it usually claims no

jurisdiction. But, besides the natural right of self-defence, exercised in such a proceeding, the offence of one nation against another is supposed to render it morally *inferior*, while the innocent character of the injured nation is supposed to give it a moral and civil superiority over the first, which invests it with the authority and right to—

——“Wrong the wronger.,
“Till he renders right.”

And a nation resorting to such measures, under strong necessitating circumstances, has the Divine approval, and may expect the Divine support. In further illustration of this position, permit me to quote the words of Dr. Louth:—“If it were not for war, therefore, there could be no provision made of doing justice on an offending nation: justice would only prey upon particular persons [individuals], but national robberies, national murders, must pass in triumph, with the reputation of virtues, as high and great actions, above the control of those common rules that govern the particular [individual] members of societies. In a word, society could not consist, if it were not lawful for one nation to exact compensation for the injuries done to it by another; and upon the refusal of such compensation, to endeavour to do it by force and acts of hostility. Wherefore, I conclude, that war must needs be just, when the instrument of its management is the sword of justice; and this argument is for offensive war.”

Further, “If John the Baptist, Christ himself,

and the Apostles, judged the employment of a soldier lawful, then war is lawful. The consequence is apparent; for every employment is lawful or unlawful, according to the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the actions to which it is designed: an employment being indeed nothing else but a constant engaging of a man's self in such a way of action."

This argument is thus amplified by Dr. Paley: "When the soldiers demanded of John the Baptist what they should do, he said unto them, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and and be content with your wages." (Luke iii, 14.) In which answer we do not find that, to prepare themselves for the reception of the kingdom of God, it was required of soldiers to relinquish their profession, but only to beware of the vices of which that profession was accused. The precept which follows, "Be content with your wages," supposes them to continue in their situation. It was of a Roman centurion (a *military* captain of an hundred men) that Christ pronounced that memorable eulogy, "I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel." (Luke vii, 9.) The first Gentile convert who was received into the Christian Church, to whom the Gospel was imparted by the immediate and special direction of Heaven, held the same situation. (Acts x. 1.): and in the history of this transaction we discern not the smallest intimation, that Cornelius, upon becoming a Christian, quitted the service of the Roman legion; and that his profession was objected to, or

his continuance in it considered as in any wise inconsistent with his new character."

And in confirmation of the above, we find from Dr. Cave's "Primitive Christianity, that in the earliest and purest days of the Christian church Christians * "bore arms"—"fought for the Emperor, while they continued in prayer for him"—held commissions—and sometimes composed whole legions, therefore, called "Christian Legions." It is true, they would not fight in what they thought to be a cause of cruelty and injustice. Mark the language of the "Theban legion" to the Emperor Maximianus; "We offer our hands against any enemy, but count it unlawful to imbrue them in the blood of the innocent: our swords know how to strike a rebel or an enemy, but not to wound those who are citizens and guiltless; we remember that we took up arms for, not against friends and fellow-citizens: we have always fought for justice and piety, and for the safety of the innocent: these have been hitherto the price of those dangers we have run upon; we have fought for fidelity, which, how shall we be able keep to you, if we do not first keep it to our God."—Might we also ask, have not some of the holiest men of *modern times* followed the profession of arms, and some of them died exulting in the Saviour's love on the field of battle? Let the history of a Haime, of a Burgess; of Captains Webb, Scott, and Hawtry; of the Haldanes; and of Col. Gardner,

* See Vol. 1, pp. 37, 39, 60, 66, 80, 82.

who fell at the battle of Preston-pans, answer the question.

But it has been objected to the lawfulness of war, and, of course, the lawfulness of a christian man bearing arms, "If we are expressly commanded 'not to resist evil, but being smitten on the right cheek, to turn the other also,' as in Matt. v, 39 ; and to recompense no man evil for evil, nor to 'revenge ourselves, but rather give place to wrath,' as in Romans xii, 17, 19. If also, we are commanded to love our enemies,' as in Matt v, then war, which is the direct contrary, is utterly unlawful." To these Scriptures we answer, that they are to be understood only of private revenge inflicted by one individual upon another, and not of a public chastisement managed by the authority of the magistrate. That the words are so to be understood is clear, as the occasion upon which those in Matt. v, were uttered shows : for the object of Christ was evidently to repudiate the corrupt gloss of the Pharisees upon the law, who taught that it was lawful for any private man, to right and revenge himself with his own hands ; provided he did not exceed a just proportion between the punishment inflicted and the evil which had been suffered : whereas Moses committed the execution of this law of retaliation to the magistrate only. Hereupon Christ tells them, that it was the duty of private men not to resist evil, nor to revenge themselves. But that the prohibition of revenge, in Rom. xii, 19, concerns only private men, and not absolutely condemns all punitive acts

when enacted by public authority is manifest; for only in the beginning of the next chapter the Apostle is so far from denying this to the magistrate, that he shows that it is the express design of his office, viz. "a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."—As for the injunction to "love our enemies," we may remark, (1.) It is directed by Christ to individual persons, not public bodies or whole nations. (2.) But admitting that it extends to these also, yet I assume that the love here commanded is not properly a love of friendship, but a love of charity; which consists in a freedom from any malice to, or hatred of, our enemies' persons: and this may continue to be maintained, even while a man, either in the defence or vindication of his country, kills his adversary in the field. For I suppose a judge may be in charity with a malefactor while he condemns him; and the sheriff or executioner have no design or hatred to him whom, by the duty of his office, he makes a sacrifice to common justice. The case is the same in war; where, when a man kills another, it need not be because he has not a love of charity to his person, but because he is bound to love his prince and his country with a greater love.

Having in this manner disposed of the first problem, I proceed to the second, viz:—

II. IS THE PRESENT WAR, ON OUR PART, JUSTIFIED BY THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE?

This inquiry also, after careful deliberation, we answer in the *affirmative*—We say yes.

DR. PALEY has remarked, in his "Moral and Political Philosophy," that "the justifying causes of war, are, deliberate invasion of right, and the necessity of maintaining such a balance of power amongst neighbouring nations, as that no single State, or confederacy of States, be strong enough to overwhelm the rest. The objects of a just war are, precaution, defence, and reparation. In a larger sense, every just war is a *defensive* war, inasmuch as every just war supposes an injury perpetrated, attempted, or feared."

If the above position is correct, and we conceive that few will be prepared to dispute it, then the war of Great Britain with Russia is justified in every point of light in which it can be viewed. *Compassion for the weak and injured* ; an *honorable maintenance of treaties and fidelity to allies* ; and a proper regard for the *civil, social, and religious* interests of the *civilized world*, all conspire to vindicate the conduct of the British Government in this matter: as these constituted the motives by which it was actuated in commencing hostilities. Nothing else would have aroused the British nation. The state of her commercial interests, and the prevalence of christian principles had originated a pacific policy which had obtained for many years past a marked character. A policy which, in certain quarters, was esteemed poltroonery, to which, in some cases, we confess, it bore a strong semblance. During the whole of this time how different has been the conduct of Russia. The

policy of this empire, since the days of Peter the Great, has been one undeviating course of onward grasping ambition. Especially has she had an envious eye on the Sultan's European possessions,—the way of access to the Mediterranean by means of the Bosphorus, and to Constantinople as the capital of her empire.

In this last instance, she began,—after vainly tampering with England and France to induce them to give some countenance to the infamous project of seizing the “sick man's” possessions—by insolently demanding a protectorate over the Christian subjects of the Ottoman empire, equal to the Sovereignty of nearly four-fifths of the entire population!

The rejection of this unreasonable demand on the part of Turkey, which reached St. Petersburg on the 26th of June, 1853, and on the same day the Emperor Nicholas issued a manifesto, announcing his intention of occupying the Danubian Principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia, as a “material guarantee” for the submission of Turkey to his requirements. On the 2nd of July a Russian army Corps, under General Dannenberg, crossed the Pruth, near Jassy, and entered Moldavia, thus effectually commencing warlike operations without formally declaring it. Still England did not go beyond expostulation, and even Omar Pasha, the most renowned of the Turkish generals, though he had an army at his command amounting to 120,000 awaited the expiration of the guaranteed *eight days*, which had been accorded to Russia to set herself

right with that power. During this period of Britain's hesitation, Russia, having command of the Black Sea, perpetrated the dastardly and murderous massacre of SINOPE, and occupied the Principalities to the banks of the Danube, the mouths of which she obstructed. Nearly a year passed between her first aggressive movement, before Britain declared war, which declaration was formally made so late as the 28th of March, 1854, little more than a year ago. And after this declaration how slow and forbearing were her movements. The allies may be said to have rendered no effectual assistance in the stupendous achievement of worsting the Russians in every battle, and, finally of driving them, single handed, out of the Principalities. Though dispatched in the Spring, their troops did not engage the enemy till Autumn. And what generosity and forbearance marked their course, after hostilities commenced. Although they destroyed the batteries, magazines, and vessels, in the harbour of Odessa, they studiously spared the town. In view of all these facts, could England have shown more aversion to war? Could she have resorted to any more pacific expedients than those to which she did resort, before she drew the sword? And what, I would ask, would have been the effect on the freedom of Europe, on its civilization and religious improvement, had the allies—had ENGLAND—stood passively by, and suffered an absolute, semi-barberous, and grossly superstitious, fanatical, and intolerant power to work out her schemes 'of con-

quest and aggrandisement? These consequences are well set forth in a speech delivered in Glasgow, by Sir Archibald Allison, the eminent historian, while it further vindicates the equity and necessity of the struggle in which we are now engaged:—“While we are engaged in a contest with one of the greatest and most powerful empires in the world, we have the satisfaction of thinking that we avoided the contest as long as it could be done with safety—that we did not draw the sword till it was evident it could not be kept in the scabbard without dishonour. If we had allowed that great Power which already overshadows all the east of Europe, to go on for another quarter of a century as it has for the last century and a half, swallowing up kingdom after kingdom, province after province, harbour after harbour, fortress after fortress, it is easy to see that the time is not far distant when the danger would roll to our own shores, when our independence and liberty would be menaced, not as now, by an enemy of seventy millions, but an enemy of seventy millions having alliances of one hundred and forty millions; and ere long we would be compelled to fight in defence of our homes and hearths on our own shores, and possibly the fate which is now befalling Sebastopol would be our own, and we would be seeing our streets obstructed by dead bodies unburied, as well as the air tainted with the corpses around us.” Such was the necessity of the war into which we have been reluctantly driven by the magnitude of the danger which threatened, not

less our national independence, than the fortune and happiness of every individual in the community.

An objection has been made calculated to damp the ardour of the piously disposed in the enterprise in which our country is engaged, and that is to this effect:—*that we are siding with a Heathen nation against a christian.* Supposing we are, we are siding with the heathen nation in a matter in which it is *right*, and the professedly christian nation is *wrong*. Besides, we are bound to the former by solemn treaty. Did Israel refuse to fulfil her promises to Gibeon against the confederate Kings, because she was heathen? Certainly not. But, alas, how little of true Christianity there is in Russia. Nay, there is very little, if any more, of true religion in the tenets and practices of the Greek church, which is its established religion, than there is in Mohamedanism itself; and the Russian government is vastly more intolerant of the circulation of the Holy Scriptures and the labours of Protestant Missionaries, than the Turkish Divan. Further, the dependence of the Porte on the allies, and the intercourse of his subjects with British christians, are calculated to subserve, in a variety of ways, the interests of her christian population, besides the gradual weakening and final extension of Moslemism itself. And should the allies wrest the Crimea from the government of Russia, that interesting country would furnish an additional and delightful field for evangelical effort.

It is a war, therefore, about which no good man

need feel any scruples, and for the success of which he ought to pray devoutly and earnestly.

These observations will conduct us to the *third* inquiry, viz. :—

III. HAVE WE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT AN HUMBLE AND PENITENT APPLICATION TO THE ALMIGHTY WILL PROPITIATE HIS FAVOUR AND OBTAIN HIS HELP? We have.

Is he not the watchful superintendent and disposer of all events? Is he not “a God who heareth prayer”? who has appointed that we must “ask if we would receive?” and who has assured us that “if we ask, we shall receive?” yea, he has said, “Call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver you.” “Man’s extremity,” is indeed, “His opportunity.” He often suffers us to be involved in difficulties, that we may be brought to feel and acknowledge our dependence on him for help. Nor does he suffer us to cry in vain. How many instances does history, both sacred and profane, record of national deliverances in answer to humble prayer to God. Some of these may be referred to :—

Were not fasting and humiliation with prayer before God, on the part of Israel, as recorded in the *twentieth* of Judges, the means of turning back the tide of battle on the offending, but for a time, successful Benjamites? What was the issue of a pious Hezekiah’s tearful spreading of the impending calamity before God in the temple, but the frustration of the objects of the boasting Sennacharib’s invasion, but the putting a hook in his jaws by which

he was turned back by the way by which he came, leaving 85,000 of his army dead behind him? How many signal deliverances, in answer to prayer, as recorded by Josephus, were wrought for the Jews in the time of the Maccabees, out of the hands of the kings of Syria, who came against them with overwhelming numbers and in exterminating wrath. We have not forgotten as Britains the signal deliverance wrought for Protestant England, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, from the danger of disastrous invasion by what was called the "Invincible (Popish) Armada," in answer to an anxious nation's earnest prayers. A force consisting of 150 ships, most of which were of a remarkable size, carrying 2,850 guns, and having on board 20,000 troops, and 8,000 sailors, beside 2,000 volunteers of the most distinguished families—a force which was to have been augmented by 34,000 men, assembled in the neighbourhood of Dunkirk: while the English Navy at that time consisted of only 30 ships of war. But the loss of the Spanish Admiral, a violent tempest the day after they sailed,—contrary winds,—the adroit and successful attack of the British Admiral, and, finally, another serious storm, off the Orkneys, whither they had been driven by adverse winds, not only prevented their landing, but so discomfited and scattered them, that only a miserable remnant returned to Spain. With what propriety, therefore, did Elizabeth cause a medal to be struck, representing their disasters, with the inscription:—"Thou didst blow upon them, and the sea covered them."

Similar interventions on a smaller scale might be mentioned, in connection with the Irish Rebellion, in 1798,—instance New Ross and Hackettstown; and during the threatened invasion of England by France in 1803, during which impending calamity, united prayer was offered to their Divine Protector; nor was it offered in vain. During the present war there has appeared a striking connection between prayer and victory. It was something more than a mere coincidence, that the memorable Sunday on which the battle of Inkermann was fought, when *fourteen* or *fifteen* thousand Allies pushed nearly *sixty thousand* Russians off the field of battle, leaving 15,000 dead behind them, that the evangelical christians of Constantinople spent the day in special intercession to the God of battles in behalf of these forces in the Crimea. The above instances constitute abundant encouragement to united, earnest, and believing prayer in this emergency.

But there are motives connected with humanity and a regard for the interests of morality and religion, which should induce us to pray, not only now but to continue praying till the object is gained, for a speedy and successful termination of this struggle. For the sooner the victory is won, though it may involve severe measures, the greater the amount of evil prevented in the end. And surely the miseries and evils of war, how necessary so-ever it may sometimes be, are of a character to excite the wish for its speedy termination. “To perish in a moment, to be hurried instantaneously, without

preparation and without warning into the presence of the supreme Judge, has something inexpressibly awful and affecting." Since the commencement of these hostilities not less than 200,000 human beings in one way and another, have perished. Yes, 200,000 human beings, to whom life was as dear as it is to us, have been prematurely swept into the grave ; each of whose death has wrung the heart of a mother, a wife, a sister ; or the hearts of a large circle of friends. And so numerous have been these scenes of complicated distress that there are doubtless some parts of Europe in which scarcely a family is exempt. Then look at the richness of the spoils of death in time of war. Under other circumstances, the victims of death are usually the feeble and the aged, who according to appearances or the course of nature, cannot expect to live long. But it is otherwise in war. The young, the healthy, and the active are struck down. Some one has said, "In peace children bury their parents, but in war parents bury their children." Nor is the difference small. There is much to moderate the sorrow of a young person on losing an aged parent, however revered ; but for such a parent to be bereaved of his children is to lose his only earthly consolation. How affecting are the circumstances of a widowed mother, while she "weeps for her children and will not be comforted, because they are not."

"What a scene must a battle-field present, where thousands are left without assistance and without pity, with their wounds exposed to the piercing air,

while the blood, freezing as it flows, binds them to the earth, amidst the trampling of horses and the insults of an enraged foe." "Far from their native home, no tender association of friendship, no well known voice, no wife, or mother, or sister, is near to sooth their sorrows, relieve their thirst, or close their eyes in death."

But look at the situation of the countries which are the theatre of hostilities—the trampling of harvest fields, the burning of cottages, the flight of helpless women and children, the destruction of property, and the carnage, violation, and ruin attendant on the capture and sacking of towns and cities.

The *commercial* evils of war are much to be deprecated. It drains a country of the most active of its population—exhausts its wealth in the equipment of fleets and armies—discourages private industry—augments the price of all the necessaries of life—and often induces famine and desolation in the worst of forms.

Religion languishes when war prevails. Mr. Wesley remarks, "When a land is visited with famine, plague, or earthquake, the people commonly see and acknowledge the hand of God. But when war breaks out, God is forgotten, if he be not openly defied. What a glorious work of God was at Cambushlang and Kilsyth, from 1740 to 1744; but the war that followed tore it all up by the roots, and left scarce any trace of it behind; in-so-much that when I diligently inquired, a few years

afterwards, I could not find one that retained the life of God."

We have said enough to lead to humiliation before God for the sins, personal and national, which have brought down the calamities of war upon our nation; to lead us to offer up most earnest and continued prayer for a speedy and successful issue out of it; and to awaken our sympathies for the immediate sufferers in our own nation, the widows and the orphans of the generous and martyred defenders of our country, and to lead us to the discharge of a most *sacred debt*, by a *liberal contribution to the Patriotic Fund*. Let it be of a character to make the heroic men who fight our battles, feel that if they fall in the conflict, they leave their "widows and fatherless children" to the kind and paternal care of a grateful country. I add no more.

ERRATA.—A few typographical errors which escaped the notice of the proof-reader, and which remained until a few impressions of the first sheet were printed, were afterwards corrected.—Ed.



